

REMARKS

Claims 7 and 14 were amended. Claims 16 and 18 were canceled. No new matter has been added. Claims 7 to 12 and 14 to 18 are now pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Cave, Evans, Foladare references

Claims 7 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,175,562 to Cave et al. (“Cave reference”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0002325 to Evans et al. (“Evans reference”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,602 to Foladare (“Foladare reference”).

The Cave reference appears to concern a system in which standard POTS call signals received from the PSTN are digitized and compressed by a POTS/packet gateway from 64 Kbps to approximately 5-6 Kbps. The POTS/packet gateway then converts the signal into packetized format. And, responsive to a call distribution algorithm identifying the next available agent by IP address, the caller’s packetized voice signals are distributed to the agent over the ethernet. The Cave reference states that the agent may then converse with the caller using a headset connected to a standard desktop computer running CODEC software to transmit and receive packetized voice signals. The Cave reference further states that the computer runs browser software to allow the agent to receive html documents and send back updated information while talking to the caller. The Cave reference refers to using web-enabled database tools at the server to generate the formatted screens displayed to the agent.

The Evans reference appears to concern a mobile handset having a browser application to interpret a multimedia document received from a remote server by recognizing textual presentation markup tags in the document and presents text to a user in accordance with the markup tags.

The Foladare reference appears to concern a call center in which call center functions are provided to a plurality of remotely located customer service representatives via a data network such as the Internet. The Foladare reference refers to having a call control server provides call control pages that include a set of clickable commands (e.g., transfer, hold, conference, speed-dial buttons, and the like) and telephone digits to CSR computers that allow CSRs to remotely control telephone calls.

In contrast, claim 7 of the present invention concerns a circuit arrangement to provide a desktop functionality for a telecommunications terminal used in computer-aided telecommunications, in which an application interface is provided in which any functional scope of the desktop control and status-display functions and the call-related data being provided and an application interface are defined *by at least one web document stored on the web server, wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document*. Further, claim 7 also requires that when *any access via the at least one of the system-bound telephone and the internet telephone occurs, an authentication is effected by the intelligent communications system before the at least one web document is loaded* and *wherein the authentication is verified for the web document only for the first time the web document is loaded, such that authentication does not occur for any subsequent uploading of the latest version of the web document*. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the Cave, Evans and Foladare references does not teach or describe that any functional scope of the functions and data is provided through at least one web document stored on the web server wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document, nor the authentication requirement such that the authentication does not occur for any subsequent uploading of the latest version of the web document, as required by claim 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claim 7 and its dependent claims 8 to 12 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Tsuboi, Evans, Foladare references

Claims 7 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by “Development of Computer Telephony Integration System ‘CTSTAGE’,” by M. Tsuboi et al. (“Tsuboi reference”) in view of the Evans and Foladare references.

The Tsuboi reference appears to concern a system for an office in which messages can be accessed and personal information can be set from the mail client and the web browser running on a client PC. See, e.g., Tsuboi reference, page 63. However, the Tsuboi reference does not current the deficiencies of the Evans and Foladare references as the Tsuboi reference does not teach or describe each and every element of claim 7 of the present invention, including a system in which *any access via at least one of a system-bound telephone and an internet telephone is provided with desktop control and status-display functions and call-related data in a dynamic interface of a web browser*, that any functional scope of the control and functions of the call-related data is provided and an application interface is *defined by at least one web document stored on the web server, wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document*.

latest version available of the respective web document. Claim 7 further requires that *an authentication is effected by the intelligent communications system before the at least one web document is loaded.*

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Tsuboi reference in combination with the Evans and Foladare references does not teach or does not teach or describe that any functional scope of the functions and data is provided through at least one web document stored on the web server wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document, *nor* the authentication requirement such that the authentication does not occur for any subsequent uploading of the latest version of the web document, as required by claim 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claim 7 and its dependent claims 8 to 12 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Chang, Evans, Foladare references

Claims 7 to 12, 14, 15, and 17, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0095542 to Chang (“Chang reference”) in view of the Evans and Foladare references.

The Chang reference appears to concern a communications system involving a public switched telephone network; an internet protocol network; a private branch exchange with a telephone coupled thereto to route a telephone call over the PST network; and a voice gateway coupled to the PBX and to the IP network to route a telephone call over the IP network. The Chang reference in combination with the Evans and Foladare references discussed above does not teach or describe each and every element of claim 7 of the present invention, including a circuit arrangement system in which any functional scope of the functions and data is provided through at least one web document stored on the web server wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document, *and* the authentication requirement such that the authentication is required, but does not occur for any subsequent uploading of the latest version of the web document, as recited by claim 7. Claim 14 recites features analogous to those of claim 7 and is allowable for essentially the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claim 7 and its dependent claims 8 to 12, as well as claims 14, 15 and 17, is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Chang, Evans, Foladare, Barnett references

Claims 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Chang (“Chang reference”) in view of the Evans reference, the Foladare reference, and the Barnett reference. Claims 16 and 18 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of those claims are now moot. With respect to the current claims, the Barnett reference does not cure the deficiencies if it were to be combined with any or all of the above references in that

the Barnett reference appears to concern a method for recording, reproducing, modifying, and displaying image information in which an electro-optical scanner, such as a camera, scans an image field and generates signals that vary in accordance with variations in the optical characteristics of the matter and objects in the image field scanned. The Barnett reference does not teach or describe how a circuit arrangement system in which any functional scope of the functions and data is provided through at least one web document stored on the web server wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document, *and* the authentication requirement such that the authentication is required, but does not occur for any subsequent uploading of the latest version of the web document, as recited by claim 7.

CONCLUSION

In view of all of the above, it is believed that any rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 7 to 12 and 14 to 18 should be withdrawn, and that all currently pending claims 7 to 12 and 14 to 18 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that any rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 15, 2010

By: Linda Lecomte/ 
Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
Tel. (212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

R.L.